

REMARKS:

Claims 3, 4, 5, 9, 10 and 15-17 are pending in the application.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 15 and 16 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,496 to Itoh et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,845 to Suzuki et al. Claims 5, 10 and 17 were rejected as being obvious over Itoh and Suzuki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,133,894 to Yagyu. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The general features of the embodiments of the present invention and the teaching of the cited references are discussed in earlier responses and are not repeated here. Independent claims 3, 9 and 15 recite various parameters of the claimed reflection type liquid crystal display apparatus, which the Examiner kindly summarized in a Table I on page 4 of the Office Action. The Examiner further summarized various parameters described in the Itoh and Suzuki references. The applicant submits, however, that Table I still fails to show that the Itoh and Suzuki references render the present claims obvious.

First, the applicant notes that the various parameters from Itoh and Suzuki included in Table I are taken from different embodiments described in these references. For example, for the Itoh reference (see page 3 of the Office Action), the Examiner cites a retardation of the phase plate (320 to 420 nm) from Fig. 32, which is a part of Embodiment 17 (see col. 32, line 30 and col. 29, line 7). The Examiner also cites a twist angle of the LC (200 to 270 degrees) from col. 36, lines 60-61, which is a part of Embodiment 22 (see col. 36, line 41). In Embodiment 22, however, the retardation of the phase plate is 600 nm (col. 36, lines 41-43), which is outside of the range 320-420nm used in Embodiment 17. Thus, the applicant submits that it is inappropriate to list the above two values -- the retardation of the phase plate of 320 to 420 nm and the twist angle of the LC of 200 to 270 degrees --

in a single column in Table I as if they were disclosed as a part of a single LCD apparatus.

Second, even when the parameters listed in the Itoh and Suzuki columns of Table I are taken as they are presented, still these two references do not teach or suggest all limitations of claims 3, 9 or 15. For example, neither Itoh nor Suzuki teaches or suggests a twist angle of the LC “equal to or larger than 40 degrees and equal to or smaller than 55 degrees” as recited in claims 3 and 15. Neither Itoh nor Suzuki teaches or suggests a retardation of the phase plate of “equal to or larger than about 160 nm and equal to or smaller than about 200 nm” as recited in claim 9. Thus, while the applicant appreciates the Examiner’s summary set forth in Table I, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s conclusion on page 4 that “the teachings of both Itoh and Suzuki essentially cover all the design parameters ...”. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 3, 9 and 15 are patentable over the Itoh and Suzuki references.

The Yagyu references cited against dependent claims 5, 10 and 17 do not cure the deficiencies of Itoh and Suzuki noted above. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

Appln. Ser. No. 09/624,062
Amendment Dated August 10, 2004

PATENT
Atty. Docket No. 81940.0001
Customer No. 26021


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: August 10, 2004

By: _____


Ying Chen
Registration No. 50,193
Attorneys for Applicants

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: (213) 337-6700
Fax: (213) 337-6701